



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*FS*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/277,229 03/26/99 CITRON

M A-581

021069  
AMGEN INCORPORATED  
MAIL STOP 27-4-A  
ONE AMGEN CENTER DRIVE  
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91320-1799

HM12/1016

EXAMINER

RAO, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

*14*

**DATE MAILED:**

10/16/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/277,229	CITRON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Manjunath N Rao	1652

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 September 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on 10 September 2001. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): USC 102(b)/103(a) rejections of claims 10 and 17.

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attached.

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 13 and 14.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 11-12, 15-16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.

10.  Other:

***Advisory Action***

1. The amendments and the request to reconsider has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because of the following.

In response to the previous Office action, applicants have traversed the rejection of claims 11, 12, 18 –20 under 35 USC, Section 112, First Paragraph arguing that the terms “allelic variant”, splice variant etc. are fully supported by their specification and that claims 11 and 12 encompass only biologically active  $\beta$ -secretase polypeptides and that the skilled technician could easily prepare a very large number of candidate  $\beta$ -secretase polypeptides by simply following the guidance provided by the applicants. Applicants further go on to provide references to their specification for support. In conclusion, applicants reiterate that contrary to Examiner’s statement, all splice variants and allelic variants encompassed by the applicants’ invention have a well defined functional activity and the claims are fully enabled by their specification. Examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all, it appears that applicants are arguing the above rejection as an enablement rejection while actually the rejection is due to lack of “written description” according to new guidelines. Furthermore, as restated by the applicants Examiner has rejected the claims because applicants have not described the “structure” and function of the genus of the encompassed polypeptides. While they have argued that their claims are directed to “biologically active  $\beta$ -secretase polypeptides”, their argument has not addressed the question of description of structures of all the encompassed polypeptide. Therefore, the above rejection is maintained by the Examiner.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manjunath Rao whose telephone number is (703) 306-5681. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner’s supervisor, P.Achutamurthy, can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax number for Official Papers to

Art Unit: 1652

Technology Center 1600 is (703) 305-3014. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Manjunath N. Rao. Ph.D.  
October 12, 2001

*Rebecca Rorty*  
REBECCA E. RORTY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800  
1600